DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 057 667 FL 002 757

AUTHOR Kaplan, Robert B.
TITLE Guidelines: English Language Proficiency.
INSTITUTION National Association for Foreign Student Affairs, Washington, D.C.
SPONS AGENCY Department of State, Washington, D.C.
REPORT NO FSP-G-3
PUB DATE 71
NOTE 37p.; Revised

EDRS PRICE MF-$0.65 HC-$3.29
DESCRIPTORS Aptitude; College Faculty; College Language Programs; College Programs; Communication (Thought Transfer); *English (Second Language); *Foreign Students; Grading; *Guidelines; Higher Education; Language Instruction; *Language Proficiency; *Language Programs; Language Teachers; Language Tests; Linguistic Competence; Program Administration; Second Language Learning; Universities

ABSTRACT

The guidelines presented here consider important questions of English language proficiency for foreign students entering colleges and universities in the United States. Several problems are discussed: admissions, measurement of proficiency, responsibility of the institution, administration of the English-as-a-second-language (ESL) program, ESL and other subjects, follow-up and evaluation, operation of the ESL program, choice of what should be taught, and funding for the program. Appendixes list ESL tests available, services offered by agencies in the international field, and guidelines for intensive English programs. A bibliography is included. (VM)

FIELD SERVICE PUBLICATIONS
G-3

ED057667

Guidelines

ENGLISH LANGUAGE PROFICIENCY

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
OFFICE OF EDUCATION
THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL OFFICE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY.

FL002757

NATIONAL ASSOCIATION FOR FOREIGN STUDENT AFFAIRS
1

Published by the

NATIONAL ASSOCIATION FOR FOREIGN STUDENT AFFAIRS

FIELD SERVICE PROGRAM

REVISED: FALL, 1971

NAFSA CENTRAL OFFICE: 1860 19th STREET, N.W., WASHINGTON, D.C. 20009

Please order from this address.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

The Nature of Language and of Language Learning 1
What is Language? 1
What is Competence? 2
What is Aptitude and Motivation? 3
What is Learning? 3

The Problem of Admission 4
English Proficiency as a Criterion for Admission 4
English Teaching Abroad 5
Proficiency and Academic Success 5
The Measurement of Proficiency 5
TOEFL Interpretation 7

After Admission—What? 8
The Responsibility of the Institution 8
Policy and Planning 8
Alternatives 8

The Administration of the ESL Program 10
Remediation 10
Academic Credit 10
Graduate Language Requirements 10
ESL vs. Freshman English 11
An Academic Home for ESL 11
Grades 12
Faculty 12

ESL and the Other Disciplines 13
Special English 14
The TESL and the Other Faculty 15
The TESL and the Registrar 15
Graduate vs. Undergraduate 15

Follow-up and Evaluation 16
Follow-up 17
Evaluation 17

The Operation of the ESL Program 17
The Minimal Program 17
The Optimal Program 18
Other Kinds of Programs 21

What Should Be Taught? 22
Speaking 22
Listening 23
Reading 23
Writing 23
General Considerations 24
Homework 24

Funding the ESL Program 25

Conclusion 25

Appendix I: Some Tests of English as a Second Language 27

Appendix II: Services Offered by Agencies in the International Field 29

Appendix III: Guidelines for Intensive English Programs 30

Bibliography 31

THE NATURE OF LANGUAGE AND OF LANGUAGE LEARNING

Before taking up the important questions of English language proficiency for the foreign student entering colleges and universities in the United States, it would be worth while to consider some of the basic issues involved. What is it that the foreign student is asked to do when he is required to demonstrate some sort of proficiency in English?

What is Language?

In general, a language may be defined as the systematic means employed by the community of its speakers to organize the world as they collectively perceive it—a world which is uniquely different from that in which the speakers of some other language live. In this sense, everything within the system of that language contributes something both to the language itself and to the organization of reality. The possible sounds and the ways in which they are arranged, the variations of pitch, stress, and silence within these permissible sounds, and the grouping of those sounds into meaning units all contribute. Indeed, the meanings of those units, the permissible sequencing of those units, and the ways in which those units are grouped into meaning-carrying utterances also contribute. The ways in which the individual utterances are compiled into units of discourse, and the ways in which all of the listed functions are translated into a graphic representation and decoded from that graphic representation also constitute elements of a language. They are the building blocks of the system of that language. The items contained in each of the listed functions are both reflections of the way in which the community of speakers of that language see the real world in which they live and limitations upon the ways in which that community of speakers *can* see the reality around them.

But language is also a means of communication. It is the device that a group of speakers use to keep in touch with each other and to convey to each other their needs, desires, and thoughts. In order to communicate with the speakers of any particular language, it is not only necessary to know the system they employ and the limits of that system, but it is also necessary to understand the system as a means of conveying information. That means both sending and receiving messages and understanding both what they mean to the receiver and what they may mean to the sender. Thus, it is necessary not only to send and receive direct linguistic messages but also to understand the immediate response, although that response may not be purely linguistic.

What is Competence?

When a foreign student is asked to demonstrate proficiency in English (or for that matter in any language), he is being asked not only to demonstrate a knowledge of the vocabulary and of the phonological and grammatical systems of the new language, but also to demonstrate a functional awareness of the limits of the world in which the speakers of that language live.

It is not enough for him to be able to string together the right classes of sounds in the right order. That exercise alone can result in a sentence like:

Framiful greeb idmas brack dufably.

Nor is it enough to string together the right classes of words in the accepted sequence.

The breathing books quietly devoured a maniac green.

While it is perfectly possible that somewhere in the linguistic universe *books* carry the attribute of *breathing*, or *green* can be described as *maniac*, speakers of English do not normally include those possibilities within their reality. It isn't even enough to write partially grammatical statements if those statements violate the reader's expectations of time—

It was on Thursday, 3:00 o'clock, May.

or create ambiguities which are unintentionally funny—

When first I through Gold Gate, I feeling strange feel.

Proficiency involves more than any of these. It involves the ability to code in completely unique utterances the thoughts of the speaker in such a way that—while the utterances *are* completely unique—those ideas can be readily comprehended by a native speaker. Such acts require more than vocabulary or grammar; they require a knowledge of how the native speaker perceives reality.

While these are simplistic illustrations of a very complex situation, they constitute only part of the situation, for communication is an act which occurs only within a context in which some stimulus generates a response appropriate to the communication. The act itself—the context, the "environment"—and its inherent stimulus and response are all in a way part of language. Proficiency implies a recognition of the context, the stimulus, and the production of an appropriate response. For example, if, in response to the question

What is your name?

a speaker replies

Since last Tuesday.

it is clear that the stimulus has been misinterpreted. If the speaker responds to the question by striking the questioner, the gap is only slightly greater.

It is necessary to distinguish between *knowing* a language and *having* a language, or to put it another way, between *translating* and *using* a language. An individual who *has* a language may be a fairly good translator; he may be able to select more or less exact semantic equivalents in both languages. That ability does not, however, mean that the individual *knows* the second language—that he can move from his native language to the perceived reality of the second language rather than only to a semantic equivalent. For example, a native speaker of English who *has* French may translate the English word *chair* into the French equivalent *chaise* without ever being aware of the French word *fauteuil* or of the existence of that subcategory of chair in the Frenchman's reality. One who "knows" both languages has the ability to divide the class of chairs one way in English and a different way in French.

What is Aptitude and Motivation?

If the new foreign student demonstrates one of the degrees of low-level proficiency illustrated in these examples, then he is commonly required to *learn* English. It is important to understand that, no matter how "intelligent" he may be, *if he is not motivated to learn, he will not do so.* In fact, it is quite possible for an individual to spend a year or more "learning" English and at the end to seem to know less than he did initially. Even if the individual is magnificently motivated, it must be realized that the acquisition of the very complex system described above will take some time. It is unrealistic to expect a student to improve his proficiency significantly in a two-week summer term; it may even be unrealistic to expect vast change in a year.

Quite aside from the amount of time involved, serious questions of objective must be considered. How much proficiency does the learner really need? Is it essential that he speak the language with native accent? Is it necessary for him to be able to write it? At what level? What are *his* expectations? What are the *teacher's* expectations? How are they related? In fact, if the learner is to acquire high-level proficiency, he must:

1. want to do so;
2. have the aptitude to do so;
3. be taught what he is expected to be able to do;
4. be given the time to learn what he is expected to be able to do;
5. be aware of what he is expected to be able to do and be sure that his teacher already can and does do it.

Students learn what they are taught. Thus, whatever aspects of any or all of the sub-systems of the language the student is expected to know must be taught, and they must be taught in such a way that the learner understands them and acquires the ability to use them at a nearly instinctive level.

What is Learning?

It is relatively easy to produce a parrot. In fact, the stronger the personality of the teacher, the greater the likelihood that he will produce little

carbon copies of himself. But the ability to parrot with great accuracy and with a relatively large inventory does not really constitute ability to *use* a language. A student is not a computer—or if he is, he is a very low-grade computer. It is not desirable to program him; it is necessary to teach him.

In brief, these constitute the assumptions from which the teacher of English as a second language ought to be starting:

1. Language is an extremely complex set of systems and sub-systems.
2. It takes time to learn this complex set.
3. If it is to be learned, it must be taught.
4. The learner ought to be motivated to learn it.
5. The learner ought to be taught, not programmed.
6. The teacher ought to understand as many of the systems and sub-systems as possible.
7. Both the teacher and the learner must possess some aptitude for their respective roles.

From these assumptions, it is possible to move on to a discussion of the various external factors involved in the acquisition of language proficiency by non-English speaking students in colleges and universities in which English is the sole means of communication and the sole medium of instruction.

THE PROBLEM OF ADMISSION

Almost since the beginning of the present influx of foreign students into colleges and universities in the United States, English proficiency has been used as a criterion for admission. In turn, this factor has led to a search for some measuring instrument which could provide secure and dependable information about proficiency. There may be a number of inherent fallacies in both requirements.

English Proficiency as a Criterion for Admission

A proficiency test is a measure of an individual's performance at a given point in time. It does not indicate how long the individual spent achieving that point; it does not indicate how long the individual will require to acquire one more linguistic item, and it does not indicate what the individual's performance will be six or ten or sixteen months after administration of the proficiency test. This means that, if English proficiency is indeed to be used consistently as a criterion for admission, only students with very high levels of proficiency may be admitted. But only a relatively small number of the total mass of students applying for admission to colleges and universities have adequate proficiency. A number of surveys indicate that somewhere between 60% and 80% of the total group admitted in any given year across the country need at least some additional training in English. (The 20%discrepancy can be explained as a failure to agree as to what constitutes "advanced" level instruction.) Furthermore, insofar as the growth of the population has been "controlled" at all, it reflects a desire on the part of funding agencies (both governmental and private) and of institutions to

serve the middle levels of the civil service and of the private sector from developing countries. This target population is exactly the one which is least likely to have had either the opportunity or the financial ability to acquire high-level proficiency.

English Teaching Abroad

Even if students abroad had had the leisure and the financial capability to acquire English, it may not have been available. In other global areas, English is taught as a foreign language—as French or German are taught in the United States. Frequently, English is taught by teachers who do not speak it themselves, in very large classes, by pedagogical strategies which are generally ineffectual, without adequate text materials. The teaching of a *foreign* language—the kind of teaching which occurs when language study is academic in a situation in which the language is "foreign" to the school and the society—is very different from the teaching of a *second* language —the kind of teaching which occurs when the language being studied is also the language of the school and of the society. The expected results under these different circumstances are necessarily different. In the United States, French or Japanese is normally taught as a *foreign* language while English is taught as a *second* language, and the expected results are different. The student learning English is expected to be able to function fully and effectively in the society; the student learning a foreign language is deemed to have succeeded if he can translate a dozen sentences with the aid of a dictionary.

Proficiency and Academic Success

Under the circumstances described above, it would be ideal if every institution could admit students regardless of their ability in English. However, such a policy clearly is idealistic and is possible only in institutions which can offer intensive language training. It would constitute a vast improvement in the information available for admission if aptitude, attitude, and motivation could be measured instead of proficiency. Unfortunately, at present no sufficiently secure, accessible, valid or reliable data exist for the measurement of aptitude, attitude or motivation. Since it is presently impossible to get the kind of information which would be most useful for admission, and since every institution simply does not have the capability of providing intensive English programs—particularly if its population is relatively small—and since admittedly English proficiency is the *sine qua non* of academic success in academic institutions in which English is both the language of instruction and the first language of general communication, academic institutions in the United States will have to continue to rely on proficiency data at least for the present.

The Measurement of Proficiency

A number of proficiency measuring instruments are available (see Appendix I). In choosing an instrument, an institution needs to consider

a number of variables:

1. Is the instrument secure?
2. Is the instrument reliable and valid?
3. Is the instrument available?
4. Is the cost of taking the instrument within the capability of most students outside the United States?

Is the Test Secure?

To put it another way, is the test easily available to anyone, or is some effort made to assure the fact that the score reported really represents the proficiency of the individual to whose name that score is attached? It is known that "ringers" sometimes take tests for other people; that answers to some tests do become available before administration, so that students may memorize them; and even that scores may be certified for students who have not taken the test. Some tests exist only in a limited number of versions which are regularly alternated, so that it is easy for potential candidates to determine which version will occur at which administration and simply to memorize the answers for that particular version. Other tests are so well administered that a completely new version is available for each administration.

Is the Test Valid and Reliable?

It is also important to know what the scores mean. Some tests have been administered to such small groups of students that one is forced to guess the interpretation of the scores. A score may be reported as a number—perhaps 62%—but without any indication of what the 62% is a proportion, nor of how many individuals get that score as opposed to how many do better or worse. In most instances, it is helpful to have data based on administration over a large population and derived from careful studies of the results.

Is the Test Available?

Some tests are administered only once or twice a year while others are administered more frequently. Some are administered only in a few places abroad, while others are administered all over the world. The availability of the test is an important consideration. A student probably should not be required to travel two or three thousand miles at his own expense (in time as well as money) just to complete a proficiency test.

Is the Cost of the Test Reasonable?

What does it cost the individual to take the test? It is important to remember that the dollar-exchange rate tends to operate against individuals from developing countries. It is important to remember too, as noted above, that the cost of getting to the test site is a very real part of the total price of the test. Obviously it is impossible in most instances,

for the academic institution in the United States to absorb the cost of overseas testing. Equally obviously, if English language proficiency is to be used as a criterion for admission, the data regarding proficiency must be available before a decision is made and certainly long before the applicant leaves his home country. Under these circumstances, employing an expensive test, or one which is not readily available, may tend to eliminate numbers of applicants.

TOEFL Interpretation

Although many tests exist (see Appendix I), the instrument which seems most nearly to fit all of the above criteria is the *Test of English as a Foreign Language (TOEFL)*, administered several times per year internationally and reported through Educational Testing Service, Princeton, New Jersey.

Even though this instrument best fits the criteria and has come to be the single most widely used instrument, *it must be used with discretion.* Institutions should not establish rigid "cut-off" scores, but rather score ranges. It is far more important to consider the profile of the candidate than it is to consider the summary score; in other words, the part scores are as important as the total score. Helpful interpretive information is available from the Educational Testing Service. However, *crudely*, the following ranges may be used as a rule of thumb:

TOEFL Scores

0-350	Do not admit under any circumstances to any program.
351-450	Admit only to an intensive language program (elementary).
451-550	Admit only to an intermediate language program.
551-600	Admit to certain academic programs in conjunction with some additional training at the advanced level in a language program.
601-800	Admit freely to any program for which the candidate is academically qualified.*

These *crude* figures do not mean that a student with a score of 349 should automatically be rejected regardless of any other factors, or that a student with a score of 601 should automatically be accepted regardless of any other factors; they do mean that a candidate with a score in the 600 range is probably a good academic risk, *all other factors being equal.* Thus, a graduate student with a Graduate Record Examination (GRE) verbal of 450, a GRE quantitative score of 650, a "B" undergraduate record, a B.S. degree from a "good" university in his home country, "good" letters of recommendation, certification of financial responsibility and adequate resources, and a TOEFL score of 610 is probably a good academic risk for admission to an M.A. program in Engineering at almost any academic institution in the United States. On the other hand, a TOEFL score of even 500 ought not be

*The English Proficiency Chart and the accompanying Statement by the National Advisory Council for TOEFL distributed by NAFSA, provides additional useful information.

the sole factor in disqualifying him.* *Appropriate use of proficiency data cannot be overstressed.*

AFTER ADMISSION—WHAT?

The previous material has been directed toward the significance of English proficiency in the admissions decision. Assuming now that the applicant has been admitted, what happens to him? There appear to be three sets of institutional problems involved in the presence of foreign students on a campus: those problems which revolve around administration, those which revolve around purely academic issues, and those which revolve around language instruction. The first of these areas is discussed below, while the others are covered elsewhere in the *Guideline*.**

The Responsibility of the Institution

The presence of even one single foreign student on a campus cannot be the exclusive concern of a teaching assistant in the English department who is responsible for a special section of freshman English designated "for foreign students". Nor can it be the sole concern of some individual in the counseling office who has been arbitrarily designated part-time foreign student adviser. The presence of even one single foreign student on a campus is the vital concern of the entire campus.

In other words, if an institution is to admit foreign students, it should have a clearly articulated policy for doing so, and that policy ought to be available as a guideline to those who deal with such students.

Policy and Planning

A clearly articulated policy may include a philosophical statement explaining the reasons for the admission of foreign students, but it must include much more than that. It must include clearly identified procedures for every level of activity from admission through completion. It should certainly include English language proficiency. The philosophical statement itself ought to specify the degree of internationalization which the particular institution wishes to accomplish and ought not merely to mouth the clichés often associated with international education. So much stress is being placed on a general policy statement because without it the whole issue of English proficiency becomes murky, and the status of the English program remains unclear.

Alternatives

The alternatives are obvious. 1) If the institution is relatively small and cannot admit large numbers of foreign students, it can a) admit only those with high English Proficiency test scores or b) require students who seem

*See pp. 15-16 for additional pertinent discussion of graduate vs. undergraduate requirements.

**See academic problems, pp. 13-15, and problems of language instruction, pp. 17-21.

to lack proficiency to attend an intensive institute elsewhere prior to unqualified admission. 2) If the institution is relatively large and can admit large numbers of foreign students, it can a) admit only those with high English Proficiency test scores, b) provide English instruction for those who clearly need it, or c) require students who seem to lack proficiency to attend an intensive institute elsewhere prior to unqualified admission.* The first recommendation in both cases is in fact somewhat restrictive, because quite small numbers of applicants achieve what is usually meant by "high" scores, i.e. 550-600 and above on TOEFL. It is evident that a small institution cannot mount an intensive English program for a total enrollment of fifteen or twenty students. (There is some evidence that the operational break-even point for an intensive program falls at approximately 100 students.)

Regional Centers

In recent years, as institutions have become gradually more aware of the problems relating to English language proficiency, there has been an epidemic growth of small programs. This growth is undesirable both because it frequently involves competitive duplication of services and competition for limited staff, and because it tends to produce heterogeneity in quality to a degree dangerous to the health of the profession, to say nothing of the effect on the students. It seems obvious that groups of institutions related through a single administration or through geographic proximity might wish to affiliate voluntarily for the purpose of centralizing these services for greater efficiency and lower cost. Such centralization may produce tangential benefits, such as providing a more realistic capacity for teacher-training, providing a physical center within which the teaching of esoteric languages may be located, and providing a cadre of individuals capable of undertaking activities in bilingual education for domestic populations, not to mention the increased capabilities for research and for materials development.

Clearly, the decisions providing any or all of these alternatives must be made initially as matters of institutional policy and must not be allowed simply to come into existence as matters of immediate need without adequate commitment. Initial institutional policy must establish not only the idea that the presence of foreign students is desirable but also an idea of the extent to which the institution is capable and willing to provide the requisite support services required by foreign students. In terms of English language proficiency, such policy will determine what proficiency level the institution must require for unrestricted admission and what proficiency levels will be dealt with by other alternatives. Thus, if the institution is

*If this alternative is selected, the applicant should be so informed and given some idea of the cost and time involved.

capable of developing and willing to develop an intensive language center, then it is also capable of admitting students solely on the basis of academic excellence and without consideration of proficiency as a criterion for admission.

THE ADMINISTRATION OF THE ESL PROGRAM

Policy will determine the location of an English program if one is to be developed, the status of its faculty, and the means of support.

Remediation

The teaching of English as a second language should be considered parallel to the teaching of foreign languages because it is a legitimate academic subject and a subject worthy of academic credit. In other words, instruction in English as a second language *should not be regarded as remedial*. Remediation implies linguistic and cultural chauvinism of the sort that most academic institutions would not willingly espouse. The learning of English as a second language is no more remedial for the foreign student than the learning of French or German is for the native speaker of English.

Academic Credit

To continue the analogy, just as the native speaker of English is able to receive academic credit for the study of French or German, the foreign student should be able to receive academic credit for the study of English. (It would also be possible to give the foreign student academic credit for the study of his native language, but such a policy may become discriminatory, if the institution does not offer course credit for such languages as Lao, Malay, Urdu, Tagalog, or Ewe. At the same time, native speakers of French or Spanish might constitute unfair competition for native English speakers trying to learn those languages.) Such considerations are applicable at the undergraduate level; at the graduate level the problem is somewhat different.

Graduate Language Requirements

Graduate language requirements are normally intended to assure the candidate's ability to read scholarly material in a language which provides a significant bulk of scholarly material in the student's academic discipline. If the foreign student plans to return to his native country and to function as a scholar in a non-English speaking environment, English may meet the intent of the requirement. On the other hand, if the candidate plans to immigrate to this society permanently, his native language may meet the intent. If it does not, the same discriminatory situation described for undergraduates may develop. However, since the intent of the graduate requirement is different from that of the undergraduate requirement, it may be possible to demand at least a reading knowledge of a language important in terms of scholarship. The definition of importance necessarily varies from academic discipline to academic discipline.

ESL vs. Freshman English

It has been suggested above that the English as a second language course is no more remedial than is a course in French or German for native speakers of English. Now it is necessary to point out that the course in English as a second language is *not* freshman English. The freshman English course is designed to take the native speaker after twelve years of formal language and literature instruction and polish him up in one final year. (Whether or not this is a realistic objective is beside the point.) Frequently, on the basis of that objective, the freshman course is structured to include the reading of and writing about literature, or a heavy component in semantics. Often the course centers on the improvement of style and on rhetorical modes. Grammar, if it is included at all, usually comes in the form of a "handbook" required but seldom used in class, and the instructor sometimes employs a composition correction key coded to that handbook. Neither the objectives nor the content are suitable to the non-native speaker. The non-native speaker, if he has difficulties with grammar, has difficulties in the area that "everybody knows". Even if he has a relatively good mastery of grammar, he is not likely to be ready for the special restricted code of literary analysis and criticism; certainly he is not ready for detailed study of English semantics.

If it is at all possible, one of three alternatives should be followed:

1. The student may be required to take freshman English after completion of one or more special courses in English.
2. One of the special ESL courses may be substituted for the freshman English requirement.
3. Some other general education requirement (perhaps the same ones available as options to foreign language study for domestic students) may be substituted for the freshman English requirement.

An Academic Home for ESL

Avoidance of the idea of remediation takes the English as a second language curriculum out of the English Department, since, in many institutions, English Departments are largely concerned with the teaching of literature rather than with the teaching of language. There is no reason to assume that a Miltonist is any more capable of teaching English as a second language than is an Industrial Engineer. By the same token, there is no natural affinity between the teaching of English as a second language and the activities of a Department of Speech. Ideally, a program in English as a second language, then, ought to exist as a separate department; if not as a separate department, then as a part of the faculty of languages.* Certainly it ought to be included in the College of Liberal Arts, since it should offer at least undergraduate academic credit in the general education area. Whether it is to be considered a humanity or a social science must remain a moot question; it bridges the division.

*The only exception to this might be the single course in ESL. Please refer to sections on "Faculty", p. 12 and "The Minimal Program", p. 17.

Ideally, then, the program in English as a second language ought to be a separate entity. It has semantic relations with English and Speech Departments, real affinities with foreign language programs, ties with linguistics and with education, and even—conceivably—a foot in computer science. Thus, it may be wise to establish the program under the supervision of an interdisciplinary committee, in the belief that good persons working together with good will should be able to produce a viable product.

Grades

The question of grading must also be raised. Certainly, if the student is to receive credit, some sort of grade should be recorded. Since motivation is so critical a factor in language learning, and since foreign students often represent cultures in which personal failure is unacceptable, the use of discrete letter grades cannot be endorsed; rather it may be wise to use either a pass/no-pass system or a credit/no-credit system. Students should not be penalized for having to continue in the same course a second time, particularly in instances where only one course is available, but there should be a limitation on the number of repetitions without penalty. While credit is desirable, the grade earned should, if possible, not affect the grade point average.

Faculty

The faculty in an English as a second language program are skilled professionals and deserve the same consideration as any other members of the institutional faculty. Presently, some twenty institutions grant M.A. degrees specifically in TESL (Teaching English to Speakers of Other Languages or Teaching English as a Second Language) and a number of institutions offer the Ph.D. in Applied Linguistics. Individuals holding these degrees cannot be considered second-class citizens in the institution's academic community. In short, faculty who teach in this special academic discipline must be entitled to tenure, promotion, and fringe benefits identical to those available to all other comparably employed institutional faculty members.

There is another matter that belongs in that initial policy statement that has so often been referred to: graduate assistants who teach some classes in English as a second language should be adequately supervised by a professional staff member. It is undesirable to allow even the single section in a small institution to be taught by an unsupervised teaching assistant.

The prior discussion presupposes the potential development of a program. Undoubtedly, however, circumstances will exist which justify the development of a single section, perhaps at the advanced level, in an institution with a small enrollment of foreign students. It is better to have such a situation than simply to allow the student to sink or swim without assistance. On the other hand, it may be wise for such an institution to recommend that its students attend an intensive program center elsewhere prior to arrival. But, should such a single class become justified, it too must be attached

somewhere and its teacher must also be considered. In such circumstances the single course probably ought to be attached to an English Department or a Speech Department; its teacher probably should be employed in such a manner that this course constitutes an appropriate fraction of his time, and the remainder of his time is committed in the department providing housing for the course. It is important that such a split appointment not be allowed to denigrate the course or work a hardship on the faculty member. Because the task may be small, it is not unimportant.

ESL AND THE OTHER DISCIPLINES

A foreign student is not likely to be involved only in the study of language for any considerable period of time. (In fact, the often mentioned policy should set outside limits for language study.) The student will become involved in academic work other than English language study, and the relationship between that other academic work and the English language class or program constitutes an important area of discussion.

The student taking an elementary intensive course probably ought not to be involved in any other academic activity. But students at the intermediate and advanced levels should undoubtedly have concurrent academic experiences either in general education (if they are lower division undergraduates) or in their major field. The student at the intermediate level probably ought to be allowed to take his first academic work outside the English program as an auditor. (Enrollment in some courses in audit status is not a violation of the student's status in terms of his visa if that audit status is recommended by the institution in the student's best academic interests.) These considerations are valid only in relation to a specifically designed program. In the case of the single class or of limited offerings, a special package should be designed to allow the student one transitional term before he undertakes full-time academic studies. Such courses as typing are often available to constitute a part of the package. Typing is not only a useful skill but will stimulate the student's motivation and will also serve to teach him some English. A specially designed course in United States History or American Institutions may serve. Foreign students are often vitally concerned with the same kinds of problems which interest domestic students—pollution, the population explosion, the urban sprawl, the political situations in Southeast Asia and in the Middle East. If there are courses concerned with these problems, the foreign student often can offer as much as he can derive. If at all possible, "Mickey Mouse" courses ought to be avoided. A student should not be placed in physical education, for example, simply because there is nothing else he can do. A student should not be isolated into a second class curriculum because he lacks linguistic skill.

If it is at all possible, the institution should give some thought to one or more introductory special courses in those disciplines where foreign students tend to congregate as a reflection of needs in their home economies

—engineering, business administration, public administration, etc. Such courses may not only help the foreign student to become more familiar with English as a medium of instruction; they may also help the foreign student to understand the expected learning mode in academic institutions in this country. Even more ideal is the situation in which such special courses can be offered not only at the beginning of the student's academic experience, but at the end as well, to help him relate what he has learned in this country to the situation in his own.

If all these options are for whatever reason unavailable, then the task falls upon the English teacher. He must solicit the assistance of the faculty in the other courses in which the foreign student is enrolled. He must involve these other faculty members to some degree in teaching English or at least in recognizing its importance to the student. Faculty in other disciplines may, through misplaced kindness, award the student a "Foreign-student C", or on the other hand may penalize the student unduly for his linguistic handicap. These excesses ought to be avoided.

Special English

Faculty in some disciplines seem to believe that there is a special English appropriate to that discipline and may ask the English teacher to teach the foreign student that English. Probably the English instructor is not prepared to teach the special vocabulary of one of the sciences. If such a vocabulary is to be taught, the science teacher will have to produce it. In all likelihood, however, that is not what the student needs; he probably already knows the vocabulary of his special interest. What he probably does not know is how to use the English preposition, the article, the verb system, and idiomatic expressions, and in this sense his linguistic problems are exactly like those of students in any other discipline.

Linguistically naive faculty fail to recognize that a student already trained in a particular academic discipline may know the jargon of that discipline quite well, and in the classroom may be able to decipher enough from context—from illustrations, examples, experiments—to follow along. But that same student may be at a total loss in the simplest social situation or in the most elementary class employing a jargon with which he is not familiar. If he is able to do so, the English instructor ought to try to elicit the direct assistance of his colleagues. He should ask them to read the foreign student's paper for linguistic structure as well as content (or alternatively to let him read it for linguistic structure while they read it for content). He should urge them not to perpetuate the oft-repeated faculty comment: "I don't care how you write; I'm only interested in how many facts you get in". (This comment may in some instances be an absurdity, at least in the case of the non-native speaker, because it may be impossible to identify the facts as facts as a result of the student's inability to write.) He should solicit at least their tacit support, for if they make disparaging remarks

about language learning, the student is more likely to accept their judgment and thus to leave the English class before he is ready to do so.

The TESL and the Other Faculty

All of these considerations demonstrate that the teacher of English as a second language will need to maintain the best possible rapport with the other academic disciplines and will need to spend a good deal of his time communicating with his colleagues to interpret for them the linguistic issues involved in educating the foreign student. Obviously, the teacher of English as a second language, the admissions officer, and the registrar must cooperate closely. The issues involved in admission have already been discussed.

The TESL and the Registrar

Not only is it desirable to allow the foreign student a certain amount of flexibility in initial registration, but it is also desirable to construct the English course in such a way that the student may leave it as soon as he has accomplished the objectives of that course, and therefore is not necessarily tied to the academic term. This flexibility contributes enormously to student motivation. It is also a sound practice, since language acquisition is a highly individualistic activity and a given student ought not to be tied to the average progress rate of his classmates. If the suggestion is contained in the institutional policy statement (so often invoked) and if the English teacher is a skillful diplomat, the registrar should be willing to cooperate.

In reverse, the preceding remarks again demonstrate the fact that the presence of a foreign student on a campus is the concern of the whole campus. Without adequate planning, the foreign student can inadvertently create a problem for every representative of the institution with whom he has contact.

To summarize then, the foreign student:

1. in an intensive elementary course ought to take no other academic work;
2. in an intermediate course ought to take one course in his major field or in general education as an auditor;
3. in an advanced course ought to take a number of special courses for credit—perhaps including typing, American Studies, or the like, but excluding "Mickey Mouse" courses.

Faculty should not:

1. employ the "Foreign-student C" or any other double standard;
2. unduly penalize the student for his linguistic limitations;
3. ignore his linguistic limitations;
4. be misled into accepting moderate competence in a "restricted code" as a substitute for proficiency.

Graduate vs. Undergraduate

The problem of the graduate student is somewhat different. It has already been suggested that the graduate student ought to be able to use the

instruction in English as a second language to meet his graduate language requirements; however, there does not appear to be a feasible way to provide graduate credit for such instruction. In spite of that fact, there is no practicable way in which functional distinctions can be made between the graduate and the undergraduate student in terms of the basic proficiency requirement. The graduate student needs English proficiency as much and essentially to the same extent as does the undergraduate. Probably most institutions offering even intensive programs will not have a large enough population to set up separate courses for graduate and for undergraduate students. It has already been pointed out that the graduate student is not likely to need special instruction in technical vocabulary; therefore, graduate and undergraduate students should receive similar treatment and similar instruction in an ESL program.

An additional word of caution about graduate placement seems necessary. Many institutions require graduate students to take the Graduate Record Examination. The verbal portion of the GRE should not be interpreted as a proficiency examination. Its difficulty level and its apparent cultural bias are such that many foreign students will not do well on it. The scores from this test may be used as supplementary data in admission, but verbal scores should not be used exclusively either for admission purposes or for placement purposes within an ESL program or class. If it is necessary for an institution to require English proficiency as a criterion for admission, graduate students should be required to take the TOEFL or whatever examination is required of undergraduate students. For placement purposes within the institution, again the same instrument should be employed for both graduate and undergraduate students.

Perhaps, in view of the above facts, the only distinction that can be made between graduate and undergraduate students is that ESL instruction can specifically be required of the undergraduate (since credit can be given), but enrollment in an ESL class or program may have to be optional for the graduate student. That does not necessarily mean that the option should be left to the student, although it may. Rather, it may be wise to permit the option to be exercised by the dean, chairman, ESL adviser, or academic adviser in the professional school or college within which the graduate is enrolled.

FOLLOW-UP AND EVALUATION

Every effort should be made to keep track of students after they have completed work in an ESL class or program. While there is no hard proof that ESL programs or classes make any significant difference in student academic performance, there is ample empirical evidence that they do make a most significant contribution. Regrettably, the great diversity in method, approach, exposure, time, and content has delayed the gathering of incontrovertible data. But that data is accessible and should be collected. Only

through careful follow-up and evaluation can the empirical evidence be substantiated with data.

Follow-up

Each class or program ought to make every effort to follow up systematically on its participants after one semester, after one year, after completion of the given curriculum, and after the student has returned home. While the student remains in the institution, follow-up may include analysis of his academic performance by consideration of his grade-point average, the number of incompleted or dropped courses, and whether or not (in the opinion of an impartial judge*) he is making adequate progress toward his academic objective. Once the student has departed from the campus, follow-up will have to be conducted along the lines of opinion survey. It appears important to contact the individual after he has departed from the institution or from the country to determine to what extent his English language training has been beneficial to him in terms of his ultimate educational objectives and in terms of his career goals. Such feedback may prevent the ESL course or program from developing internal objectives which are merely academic.

Evaluation

In addition to student follow-up, ESL classes and programs should undergo periodic review by members of the faculty of the institution to determine that such programs or classes are really meeting the objectives for which they were established. Provisions for follow-up evaluation should be included in the original policy statement in which the aims are stipulated. Such a review may reveal that the original objectives were not realistic as well as whether or not a program or class is meeting those objectives. Faculty evaluation, of course, will normally be conducted by the academic officer responsible for the class or program. Student evaluation too should be encouraged. Many institutions now provide regular procedures—official or unofficial—to elicit student evaluation. ESL classes should be included in such evaluation. There is no reason to assume that foreign students are more or less objective than their domestic colleagues.

THE OPERATION OF THE ESL PROGRAM

Institutions can offer ESL programs in direct relation to their capabilities and resources and to their populations.

The Minimal Program

In those institutions in which the population is extremely limited—perhaps twenty-five or thirty foreign students in total—the needs of that population may be met by the creation of a single course serving perhaps ten or fifteen students. It is assumed that students admitted to such an institution

*An impartial judge may be a member of the institutional faculty or a testing officer not directly connected with the ESL class or program, or a representative of NAFSA employed at another institution and utilized as a consultant.

have at least intermediate-level proficiency to begin with and that students having low-level proficiency or no proficiency either are not admitted at all or are regularly referred to an intensive center prior to unconditional admission. As stated previously the recommended single class should be administratively housed either in the Department of English or in the Department of Speech. It should be team-taught by faculty derived from both departments. It should provide a minimum of eight contact hours per week for between ten and sixteen weeks. The eight hours should be roughly equally divided between the faculty team, so that roughly half of the allotted time may be devoted to instruction in grammar and composition and roughly half to instruction in spoken language. If the teaching team can be supplemented with one or two student-assistants so much the better. Undergraduate degree credit should be available to the participants, and their loads should be adjusted so as to allow the single course to constitute no less than half of the load. Such a course should be supplemented by additional components in the load in typing, history, American Studies, or the like. Students should not be required to carry concurrently another language course, a course with heavy reading assignments, a course based on literary or semantic analysis, or a course largely based on lecture material.

Faculty involved in such a course should be selected for their training and interest. Since it is unlikely that they will be specifically trained in the teaching of English as a second language, incentives should be offered to encourage them to acquire training, preferably in the summer preceding their assignment to the class. At least one of the team members should hold faculty status, and should be assigned supervisory responsibility.

The Optimal Program

Ideally, a fully articulated program should be designed to serve a hundred or more students each semester. It should offer instruction on the elementary, intermediate, and advanced levels simultaneously.

Sectioning

Students should be assigned to the various levels on the basis of relative proficiency. It is unlikely that any except the largest programs will have populations large enough to justify sectioning along the lines of linguistic background, i.e. putting together students of the same linguistic origin *and* of the same relative proficiency. Although it may be desirable, it is also unlikely that functional separations can be made along the lines of graduate vs. undergraduate or along the lines of academic discipline, i.e. separating students by their major fields of study and putting all engineering majors in one class, all chemistry majors in another, and so on. The assumption of sectioning by level of proficiency assumes that the institution has access to a testing instrument* capable of making reasonably fine distinctions in level of proficiency. It also assumes the existence of

*See discussion of tests on pp. 5-8 and Appendix I.

sections within each level to allow for sub-categories within each of the major proficiency divisions. A program serving approximately one hundred students will probably break out into between seven and ten sections of between ten and fifteen students per section and will reflect a number of degrees of proficiency. Thus, there may be two or three levels within the elementary program, two or three sections at the intermediate level, and two or three sections at the advanced level, each reflecting a recognizable degree of proficiency tied to the placement instrument employed.

The Elementary Level

At the elementary intensive level, students ought to receive between twenty-four and thirty hours per week of instruction for between ten and sixteen weeks. The instruction should include the four areas of language activity—speaking, listening, reading, and writing—and the various technical aspects of language—reception and production of the phonological, morphological, syntactic, and rhetorical systems. It will probably be necessary to provide some language laboratory instruction with suitable equipment. (The concept of a language laboratory as a physical room is not so important; rather, the availability of a facility in which the student can hear appropriate models of the language and can, under supervision, practice the imitation and production of the language is important. Much can be accomplished with inexpensive portable cassette recorders.*) In addition, at this level, it is essential to provide a certain amount of cultural orientation. Cultural orientation goes beyond academic orientation of the sort provided domestic students and beyond local orientation of the sort available at many institutions designed to aid the student in physical adjustment to the municipality and its economic mores. Cultural orientation includes the aforementioned functions but also includes the paralinguistic systems implicit in broader communication—gesture, proxemics, social customs, linguistic conventions, etc. — and some comparative history and sociology.

The complex curriculum described above should be coordinated so that the faculty operate on the basis of a core curriculum designed around a specified group of realistic linguistic and behavioral objectives which can be measured. As classes should be small, so instructional loads should be limited (probably not to exceed twelve contact hours per week) in order to allow faculty sufficient time to meet with students individually for requisite tutorial work and counseling. Student load and credit should be so arranged that such a curriculum constitutes a full-time load both in terms of the institution's requirements and in terms of the legal requisites of the U.S. Immigration and

*See Richard Barrutia, *Language Learning and Machine Teaching* (Phila. The Center for Curriculum Development, Inc., 1970).

Naturalization Service (INS). As noted previously, degree credit should be granted the undergraduate student for this activity.

The Intermediate Level

At the intermediate level, essentially the same kinds of activities may be conducted, except at a more advanced level and for fewer contact hours per week. Basically, an intermediate level course should provide between ten and fifteen hours per week of instruction for between ten and sixteen weeks. Class size and instructional load should be maintained at the same levels as recommended for the elementary intensive program. Student load and credit should be arranged as noted, except that the intermediate program should constitute the equivalent of a half or two-thirds load so that the student may undertake one additional course as an auditor.

The Advanced Level

At the advanced level it is necessary to recognize the fact that students may have acquired some of the language skills to a relatively high degree of proficiency, but may still need work in other skills. Often the skills acquired depend in part on the nature of the students' prior training. In some global areas, language instruction is heavily dependent on the so-called "grammar-translation" system. Since students learn what they are taught, those coming from such backgrounds will probably have relatively high ability in reading and writing, but may lack skill in speaking. On the other hand, some students may originate in global areas in which heavy stress is placed upon the so-called "audio-lingual" approach; these students will have high-level skills in speaking and listening, but may be weak in reading and writing. Thus the advanced-level classes should recognize this division and provide appropriate instruction. Sections stressing reading and writing and other sections stressing speaking and listening should be offered. These sections should provide between four and eight contact hours of instruction per week for between ten and sixteen weeks. The recommendations for student load and credit, class size, and faculty load still apply.

While a progression in difficulty level is implied in such a structure, flexibility is essential. Insofar as possible, students should be allowed to progress at the most rapid rate possible; they should not be restricted unduly by the structure itself. Ideally, a student should be able to enter and leave the program at any level and at any time by proficiency examination (or by means of a combination of teacher evaluation and objective examination score).

The fallacy in the concept of a progression in difficulty lies in the fact that there is no universally recognized progression of linguistic difficulty, or rather that there is no way of proving a progression exists.

This unfortunate fact makes it even more important to have underlying such a program a clear set of linguistic and behavioral objectives specifically related to the academic nature of the task. The existence of such a set of objectives will also tend to simplify text selection, test construction, and teacher qualification.

In general, however, a significant proportion of the faculty for such a program should be specifically trained in the teaching of English as a second language and should have the experience and academic accreditation implied by such training. This is not intended to suggest that every member, or for that matter any member, of the faculty should be a trained linguist; there is no necessary correlation between successful language teaching and training in formal linguistics. The ESL curriculum is not a linguistics curriculum; its objective is not to teach linguistics, but rather language. While it is helpful for faculty members to have had some formal training in the linguistic analysis of English and in contrastive analysis, it is not necessary that they be linguists in the formal sense. Obviously it is unlikely, for economic reasons, that the total faculty of such a program will be specifically trained professionals; it may not even be desirable. Without hazard to the students involved or to the stated objectives, a portion of the faculty could be composed of graduate teaching assistants or other persons receiving training in the field. In general, the student-teacher ratio should stand at approximately 10:1, on an FTE basis.*

Such a program may enable the average student entering with very low proficiency to achieve adequate proficiency within one academic year. Such a generalization assumes high-level motivation on the part of both faculty and students.

Other Kinds of Programs

There are at least three other possible solutions:

Referral

The possibility of requiring a student to attend an intensive program at another institution has already been discussed. The Commission on Intensive English Programs (CIEP), which is part of NAFSA, may be used as a resource for identifying programs for purposes of referral.**

Community Programs

A number of institutions which, for a variety of reasons, do not choose to operate full-fledged academic programs have developed programs based on community volunteers.***

*FTE = Full Time Equivalents for both faculty and students.

**See Appendix II.

***Refer to NAFSA's Community Section (COMSEC) for additional suggestions.

In some instances, programs manned by community volunteers even serve as supplements to developed programs. The community volunteer constitutes an important resource; however, in the event that a volunteer program is the only source of English instruction available, it is essential to establish liaison between the academic institution and the volunteer group, to insure that volunteers receive some training and supervision, to provide some guidance to the volunteer group in the selection of materials to be taught and of texts to be used in teaching, and to maintain a complementary relationship between the campus officers responsible for foreign students and the community volunteers. If the community group is employed as a supplement to an existing class or program, it is necessary to develop and maintain liaison between the instructional staff and the volunteers so that the volunteer activity is indeed supportive of the academic program.

Other Programs

In addition to intensive programs located at academic institutions, there are a number of commercial schools engaged in the teaching of English as a second language. While not all of these schools are equally successful nor equally reputable, some do provide excellent services. They should not be overlooked in the quest for English instruction for foreign students. In fact, a few actually operate in affiliation with academic institutions. In addition to this resource, in many major urban centers the public school system operates one or more centers specializing in the teaching of English as a second language. Some of these centers, however, are devoted to instruction for citizenship or to vocational education; such centers do not always provide a sufficiently intensive program for college-level foreign students.

WHAT SHOULD BE TAUGHT?

As has already been noted, there is no universal agreement on a linguistic hierarchy of difficulty. Obviously, too, students at different levels of proficiency, at different academic levels, in different academic disciplines will have slightly different objectives. All of these facts make it difficult to generalize about what should be taught. Nevertheless, the four areas of language performance have already been identified—speaking, listening, reading, and writing—and while it may be impossible to stipulate what portion of the content of each of these shall be taught at what level of proficiency, it is possible to generalize what the student ought to know in order to be considered proficient.

Speaking

The student ought to be able to produce all the sounds of English in a manner that his utterances are understandable to a native speaker with a minimum of ambiguity. This does not mean that the student should be able

to produce speech without accent; it does mean that his control of the sound system should be such that he can communicate around his accent.

Listening

The student should be able to hear and distinguish all of the sounds of the language; that is, he should be able to listen to the speech of a native speaker and comprehend a very high percentage of what is being said. Misunderstanding should be largely restricted to occurrences of unfamiliar expressions rather than to phonological interferences.

Both of the prior statements about speaking and listening are grossly oversimplified because they ignore such important components of the language as word stress and sentence rhythm, grammar, and lexicon. The rhythm, while it may not be native, should not create ambiguity. It is also assumed that the student recognizes the meanings of the words he utters and that he also recognizes at least some of the grammatical signals (e.g. the common suffixes) which indicate the classes to which those words belong. It is further assumed that the student has some awareness of how these words fit into larger syntactic units (e.g. phrases and clauses). For pedagogical purposes, grammar is commonly discussed under the heading of writing, although that is obviously an artificial categorization, for grammar is equally important in listening, speaking, and reading.

Reading

The student should be able to read college-level text materials without constant reference to a dictionary and with sufficient speed and comprehension to do the typical amounts of reading required in any college-level course. It is assumed again that the student has some comprehension of lexical items, of the signals which place these items into grammatical classes, and of the permissible sequences of acceptable syntax. It is also assumed that the student must learn the permissible sequences of various rhetorical forms. It cannot be assumed that the student who can produce or receive a sentence is necessarily able to link sentences into a coherent larger context. Because languages do indeed restrict the realities of their speakers, the rhetorical system of any language is likely to be at least to some extent a reflection of allowable reality. A speaker of another language does not necessarily recognize grammatical parallelism (let alone rhetorical parallelism), nor does he necessarily recognize what elements may be made parallel.

Writing

While it has already been noted that grammar occurs in this component for pedagogical reasons, it should be clear that grammar occurs at all levels. Grammar includes the allowable relationships between words, phrases, and clauses and reflects the allowable relationships in the real world. While it is a gross oversimplification again, it can be said that the basic relationships involve coordination, subordination, and superordination; that is, an item may be equal to, smaller than, or larger than another item. While there is no general agreement on the number of kernel structures which

establish the minimal possible relationships, there is general agreement on the idea of kernel structures. Beyond grammar, the same rhetorical principles which are essential to the understanding of reading are also essential to the production of connected writing (and of connected speech as well). These larger relationships, which seem to reflect those within the sentence, may appropriately be taught in composition classes.

General Considerations

In general, development should follow some sort of progression from simple to difficult and from rigid control to nearly free expression. While there is no agreement concerning linguistic hierarchies of difficulty, it is possible to generalize that individual sounds are less complex than combinations of sounds, that root words are less complex than compound words, that basic kernel structures are less complex than compound-complex sentences, and that individual sentences are less complex than paragraphs and books. In this sense, then, there is a possible hierarchy. A second hierarchy is introduced by what the student knows. It would be wasteful to spend as much time teaching the student what he already knows as opposed to what he does not know. If, for example, a given sound exists in the student's native language in an environment similar to that in which it occurs in English, the student may be said to know that sound, and relatively little time should be spent in teaching it to him. Thus, within this matrix of hierarchies, movement should be from rigid control to nearly free expression. In composition, for example, the elementary-level student should begin writing kernel sentences of completely prescribed content and should move gradually through more complex prescribed sentences and combinations of sentences to less and less prescribed formats, until he is able to write a "free" composition given only a topic.

In general, the basic material employed in all of the areas ought to be essentially expository, since that is to a large extent what the student will encounter as a student. While it is admirable to wish to expose the foreign visitor to the excellence of Anglo-American literature, that must wait for his mastery of expository prose. If, as frosting on the cake, the student has the leisure and the opportunity to study the literature, so much the better, but it cannot be considered an essential part of the ESL curriculum; nor is the special vocabulary of literary criticism appropriate to language mastery. By the same token, humor—particularly culturally coded humor—ought to be avoided. The subject matter should be contemporary, interesting, and—if possible—provocative. It should never be propagandistic.

Homework

In general, if curricular scheduling permits, relatively little "active" homework should be given. In many countries "assistance" is not regarded as improper. Writing assignments may reflect the ability of a native English-speaking friend rather than of the student, although the help of a native speaker may be useful in a tutorial situation. Speech assignments may merely provide an opportunity for the student to practice his errors. Read-

ing assignments, however, may be given outside the class. And listening is a good out-of-class exercise if some control can be maintained; it seems relatively useless to tell a student to indulge in indiscriminate television viewing, for example. Rewriting of composition exercises may be done profitably out of class, once it is certain that the student understands what he is to rewrite and how. Most "active" assignments, however, ought to be completed in class, or at least under supervision.

In general, it is more important that a student be able to produce and recognize language than that he be able to ape or recognize "canned" dialogues; that is, the ultimate aim of language instruction is communication. Evaluation of student success ought to include devices designed to elicit and evaluate connected speech and connected writing of a completely original nature growing out of an immediate stimulus. While production and recognition of items in isolation may constitute a useful diagnostic device, it is not necessarily a useful terminal evaluative device.

It is difficult to go beyond these few generalizations in a work which purports to be no more than a guideline. In the accompanying bibliography, a number of texts which go to much greater depth are suggested.

FUNDING THE ESL PROGRAM

It should be fairly apparent that even the minimum acceptable curriculum is relatively expensive to operate. An intensive program requires a considerable initial investment of funds and facilities on the part of the parent institution. Once again, the initial statement of policy is a key element. Once an institution has committed itself to the development of such a program, resources can be identified for its support. The broad benefits derived from international education and from the presence of foreign students in any community are often sufficiently great to encourage the private sector in that community to donate to the support of such programs. Certainly at least part of the costs can be defrayed through the use of tuition monies. But it would be misleading to suggest that such programs are in themselves sources of revenue. An institution which wishes to develop an ESL program should look to the issue of financing it before developmental plans get very far. Funds must be assured in this area as in any other academic area before a program is initiated.

CONCLUSION

This guideline has been written both as an indication of a shared concern and as a set of suggestions. The reader should be somewhat gratified to know that he is not alone with his problems and that his problems are not unique to him, or his students, or his institution.

APPENDIX I
SOME TESTS OF ENGLISH AS A SECOND LANGUAGE[1]

1. Davis, A. L.
   Diagnostic Test for Students of English as a Second Language[*2]
   1953 (reprint 1956-7-9)
   Educational Services, Washington, D.C.
   Aptitude test

2. Educational Testing Service
   Test of English as a Foreign Language (TOEFL)
   not dated
   Educational Testing Service, Princeton, N.J.
   Proficiency, multiple parts

3. Harris, David P. and Leslie Palmer
   Comprehensive English Language Test (CELT)
   1970
   McGraw-Hill Book Co. (International Division), New York, N.Y.
   Proficiency, listening, structure, vocabulary

4. Lado, Robert
   Test of Aural Perception in English[*]
   1958
   English Language Institute, University of Michigan, Ann Arbor, Mich.
   Aural comprehension

5. Lado, Robert
   Test of Aural Comprehension[*]
   1957
   English Language Institute, University of Michigan, Ann Arbor, Mich.
   Aural comprehension

6. Pennsylvania State University
   Test of English Language Proficiency
   * periodically revised
   Pennsylvania State University, 317 Sparks Building, University Park, Pa.
   Tests of reading comprehension, structure, writing and redundancy utilization

7. Plaister, Ted
   Oral Production Rating Sheet
   1967
   English Language Institute, University of Hawaii, Honolulu
   Aptitude; oral spoken English

8. Plaister, Ted and Charles H. Blatchford
   Plaister Aural Comprehension Test
   1971
   English Language Institute, University of Hawaii, Honolulu
   Aural comprehension

9. Plaister, Ted and Charles H. Blatchford
   Test of English Structure
   1971
   English Language Institute, University of Hawaii, Honolulu
   Aptitude, grammar recognition

10. Upshur, John A.
Michigan Test of English Language Proficiency•
1966
English Language Institute, University of Michigan, Ann Arbor, Mich.
Aptitude, grammar, vocabulary, reading comprehension, composition

11. Upshur, John A.
ELI English Achievement Series
1963
English Language Institute, University of Michigan, Ann Arbor, Mich.
Achievement, aural comprehension, grammar, vocabulary

[1]Material for this list and for the Bibliography is derived from unpublished material prepared by John Upshur, English Language Institute, University of Michigan, Ann Arbor, Michigan. The information reported in the test description is that indicated by the test developer. It is not intended to provide more than a general idea of the type of test and the content. Dates given are for most recent forms only.

[2]The symbol • after any given test name indicates that the test has been reviewed in one of the editions of Buros, *Mental Measurements Yearbook*, (Sixth Edition, Highland Park, N.J.: The Griffin Press, 1965).

APPENDIX II
SERVICES OFFERED BY AGENCIES IN THE INTERNATIONAL FIELD

American Council of Teachers of Foreign Languages (ACTFL) (2b, 3, 4)
62 Fifth Avenue, New York, N.Y. 10011

The British Council English-Teaching Information Centre (ETIC) (2c, 3, 4, 5, 7, 8)
State House, High Holborn, London, W. C. 1, England

Center for Applied Linguistics (CAL) (4, 5, 7, 8)
1717 Massachusetts Avenue, N.W., Washington, D.C. 20036

Centro de Linguistica Aplicada (1, 3, 4, 6, 7)
c/o Dr. Francisco Gomez de Matos, Av. 9 de Julho 3166, Sao Paulo, Brazil

College Entrance Examination Board (CEEB) (1, 5)
888 Seventh Ave., New York, N.Y. 10019

Modern Language Association (MLA) (2b, 2c, 3, 4, 7)
62 Fifth Avenue, New York, N.Y. 10011

National Association for Foreign Student Affairs (NAFSA)
Field Service Program (FSP)
1860 19th Street, N.W., Washington, D.C. 20009
Admissions Section (ADSEC)
Association of Teachers of English as a Second Language (ATESL) (2b, 4, 7)
Commission on Intensive English Programs* (CIEP) (2b, 5, 6, 7)
Community Section (COMSEC)
Council of Advisers to Foreign Students and Scholars (CAFSS)

National Council of Teachers of English (NCTE) (2a, 2b, 3, 4, 5)
508 South 6th Street, Champaign, Ill. 61820

Southeast Asia Ministers of Education Council (SEAMEC)
Regional English Language Center (RELC) (1, 2a, 2c, 3, 4, 6, 7, 8)
104 Watten Estate, Singapore 11

Speech Communication Association (SCA) (2b, 3, 4)
Statler Hilton Hotel, New York, N.Y. 10001

Teachers of English to Speakers of Other Languages (TESOL)** (2a, 2b, 2c, 3, 4, 7)
c/o Dr. James Alatis, School of Languages and Linguistics, Georgetown University, Washington, D.C. 20007

KEY

1. Conducts testing programs.
2. Sponsors professional conferences:
   a. local b. national c. international.
3. Publishes scholarly journal(s).
4. Publishes bibliographies.
5. Provides other free (or inexpensive) resource materials.
6. Supplies specific information on English proficiency in reference to individual students (interprets test data).
7. Supplies information on English Teaching facilities and practices in particular global areas.
8. Maintains library-exchange facilities.

*Membership includes: Boston University, Columbia University, Georgetown University, Louisiana State University, Michigan State University, New York University, San Francisco State College, Southern Illinois University, University of California at Los Angeles, University of Hawaii, University of Illinois, University of Kansas, University of Miami, University of Michigan, University of Pittsburgh, University of Southern California, University of Texas. Official membership includes representatives of the Intensive English Programs at the institutions named.

**See also state affiliate associations: for example, California Teachers of English to Speakers of Other Languages (CATESOL).

APPENDIX III
GUIDELINES FOR INTENSIVE ENGLISH PROGRAMS*

PROGRAM STAFF:

1. An Intensive English Program should be staffed by a director and a core faculty whose principal commitments are to the program.
2. The director of the program should have at least an M.A. degree and two years of academic training in linguistics, applied linguistics, or TESL or the equivalent (which may be defined as a minimum of two years experience as a full-time faculty member in a program in ESL/EFL, either in the United States or in a binational center or comparable academic agency outside the United States). In addition, a director should have administrative experience or training.
3. Core faculty ought to have academic experience equivalent to the minimal standards for the director except in administration.
4. Other faculty (those employed part-time or as teaching assistants) should concurrently be taking graduate course work in linguistics, applied linguistics, or TESL/TEFL. If the institution offering the program does not also offer graduate programs in linguistics, applied linguistics, or TESL/TEFL, it is the obligation of the program to provide for such faculty adequate facilities and opportunities for in-service training and/or instruction.
5. Inexperienced faculty and teaching assistants must be supervised closely and directed either by the director or be specifically designated members of the core faculty.
   At least the director, and perhaps the entire core faculty, should hold regular faculty appointments (or the equivalent) at the parent institution.
6. At least the director, and perhaps the entire core faculty, should hold regular faculty appointments (or the equivalent) at the parent institution.

PROGRAM CONTENT:**

1. Intensive programs should provide at least twenty hours a week of supervised instruction of which at least fifteen must be classroom hours.
2. Intensive programs should provide (A) classes structured in such a way as to indicate recognition of the separable features of the language and (B) access to a minimum of three supervised language laboratory hours per week employing suitable equipment housed and administered under acceptable conditions.
3. If credit is given for any level of instruction, it is desirable that credit be applicable to the Foreign Language Requirement for an undergraduate degree.

*Prepared by CIEP and approved by ATESL April, 1971.

**English as a Second/Foreign Language courses and classes should not be confused or equated with remedial English courses for native speakers of English.

BIBLIOGRAPHY
for
English Language Proficiency Guideline
(September, 1971)

Prepared by ATESL in cooperation with NAFSA's Field Service Program.

TESL

Allen, Harold B., ed., *Readings in Applied Linguistics.* New York: Appleton- Century-Crofts, 1964.

_____., *Teaching English as a Second Language: A Book of Readings.* New York: McGraw-Hill, 1965.

Finocchiaro, Mary. *English as a Second Language: From Theory to Practice.* New York: Regents Publishing Company, 1964.

Fries, Charles C. *Teaching and Learning English as a Foreign Language.* Ann Arbor: The University of Michigan Press, 1945.

Jacobovitz, Leon. *Foreign Language Learning: A Psycholinguistic Analysis of the Issues.* Rowley, Mass.: Newberry House, 1968.

Kehoe, Monica. *Applied Linguistics: A Survey for Language Teachers.* New York: Collier-Macmillan International, 1968.

Lado, Robert. *Language Teaching: A Scientific Approach.* New York: McGraw-Hill, Inc., 1964.

Lester, Mark. *Readings in Applied Transformational Grammar.* New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1970.

Rivers, Wilga M. *Teaching Foreign Language Skills.* Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1968. (See also *The Psychologist and the Foreign Language Teacher.* 1964).

Schotta, Sarita G. *Teaching English as a Second Language.* Davis, California: University of California Press, 1966.

Valdman, Albert, ed. *Trends in Language Teaching.* New York: McGraw-Hill, Inc., 1966.

Wishon, George E. and Thomas J. O'Hare, eds. *Teaching English: A Collection of Readings.* New York: American Book Company, 1968.

TESTING

Davies, Alan, ed. *Language Testing Symposium: A Psycholinguistic Approach.* London: Oxford University Press, 1966.

Harris, David P. *Testing English as a Second Language.* New York: McGraw-Hill, Inc., 1969.

Lado, Robert. *Language Testing: The Construction and Use of Foreign Language Tests.* New York: McGraw-Hill, Inc., 1961.

Savard, Jean-Guy. *Analytical Bibliography of Language Tests.* Quebec: Les Presses de L'Université Laval, 1969.

Valette, Rebecca M. *Modern Language Testing: A Handbook.* New York: Harcourt, Brace and World, Inc., 1967.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Aarons, A.C., ed. "TESL Bibliography", *Florida FL Reporter.* III, 2, January, 1965.

Allen, Virginia French and Sidney Forman. *English as a Second Language: A Comprehensive Bibliography.* New York: Teachers College, Columbia University Press, 1965.

Hammer, John H. and Frank A. Rice. *A Bibliography of Contrastive Linguistics.* Washington, D.C.: Center for Applied Linguistics, 1965.

Meserole, Harrison T. *et al.*, comp. *1969 MLA International Bibliography of Books and Articles on the Modern Languages and Literatures: Linguistics.* New York: The Modern Language Association, 1970. Vol. III.

Nostrand, Howard Lee, David William Foster, and Clay Benjamin Christensen. *Research on Language Teaching: An Annotated International Bibliography—1945-64.* Seattle: The University of Washington Press, 1965.

Shen, Yao and Ruth H. Crymes. *Teaching English as a Second Language: A Classified Bibliography.* Honolulu: East-West Center Press, 1965.

LANGUAGE LABORATORY

Hayes, A. S. *Language Laboratory Facilities.* London: Oxford University Press, 1968.

Stack, Edward M. *The Language Laboratory and Modern Language Teaching.* New York: Oxford University Press, 1966.

ENGLISH LINGUISTICS

Allen, Harold B. *Linguistics and English Linguistics.* New York: Appleton-Century-Crofts, 1966.

Aurbach, Joseph, *et al. Transformational Grammar: A Guide for Teachers.* Rockville, Md.: English Language Services, 1968.

Bolinger, Dwight. *Aspects of Language.* New York: Harcourt, Brace and World, Inc., 1968.

Francis, W. Nelson. *The Structure of American English.* New York: The Ronald Press, 1958.

Friend, Joseph. *An Introduction to English Linguistics.* New York: World Publishing Co., 1967.

Fries, Charles C. *The Structure of English.* New York: Harcourt, Brace and World, Inc., 1952.

Gleason, H. A., Jr. *Linguistics and English Grammar.* New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, Inc., 1965.

Hill, Archibald A. *Introduction to Linguistic Structures: From Sound to Sentence in English.* New York: Harcourt, Brace and World, Inc., 1958.

Hughes, John P. *Linguistics and Language Teaching.* New York: Random House, 1968.

Langacker, Ronald W. *Language and its Structure: Some Fundamental Linguistic Concepts.* New York: Harcourt, Brace and World, Inc., 1967.

LeFevre, Carl A. *Linguistics and the Teaching of Reading.* New York: McGraw-Hill, Inc., 1964.

Marckwardt, Albert H. *Linguistics and the Teaching of English.* Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 1966.

Pyles, Thomas and John Algeo. *English: An Introduction to Language.* New York: Harcourt, Brace and World, Inc., 1970.

Roberts, Paul. *Modern Grammar.* New York: Harcourt, Brace and World, Inc., 1967.

Stageburg, Norman C. *An Introductory English Grammar.* New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, Inc., 1963.

Strang, Barbara M. H. *Modern English Structure.* New York: St. Martin's Press, 1963.

Thomas, Owen. *Transformational Grammar and the Teacher of English.* New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, Inc., 1965.

CULTURE

Hall, Edward T. *The Silent Language.* New York: Doubleday, 1959.

Hymes, Dell. *Language in Culture and Society: A Reader in Linguistics and Anthropology.* New York: Harper and Row, 1964.

Landar, Herbert. *Language and Culture.* New York: Oxford University Press, 1966.

Malmstrom, Jean. *Language in Society.* New York: Hayden Book Co., Inc., 1965.

Mead, Margaret, ed. *Cultural Patterns and Technical Change.* New York: UNESCO, 1955.

Smith, Alfred G., ed. *Communication and Culture: Readings in the Codes of Human Interaction.* New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, Inc., 1966.

LIST OF PUBLISHERS

It is impossible to provide a list of textbooks in ESL. Instead, a list of the major publishers is provided. All of these publishers will furnish, on request, lists of the ESL materials which they publish.

American Book Company, 55 Fifth Avenue, New York 10003
Appleton-Century-Crofts, 440 Park Avenue South, New York 10016
Center for Applied Linguistics, 1717 Massachusetts Ave., N.W., Washington, D.C. 20036
Collier-Macmillan International, 866 Third Avenue, New York 10022
East-West Center Press, 1777 East-West Road, Honolulu 96822
English Language Services Language Center, 1620 Belmont Street, N.W., Washington, D.C. 20009
Harcourt, Brace and World, Polk & Geary, San Francisco 94109
Harper and Row, 49 E. 33rd Street, New York 10016
Holt, Rinehart and Winston, Inc., Box 34400 Crocker Park, San Francisco 94134
McGraw-Hill, 330 W. 42nd Street, New York 10036
Modern Language Association, 62 Fifth Avenue, New York 10011
National Council of Teachers of English, 508 S. Sixth Street, Champaign, Illinois
Oxford University Press, 200 Madison Avenue, New York 10016

Prentice-Hall, 70 Fifth Avenue, New York 10011
Random House, 201 E. 50th Street, New York 10022
Reader's Digest Services, Inc., Pleasantville, New York 10570
Regents Publishers, 1 W. 39th Street, New York 10018
Scott, Foresman and Company, 1900 E. Lake Avenue, Glenview, Illinois 60025
Teachers College, Columbia University, 1234 Amsterdam Avenue, New York 10027
Thomas Y. Crowell, 201 Park Avenue South, New York 10003
University of California Press, 2223 Fulton Street, Berkeley, California 94720
University of Chicago Press, 5750 Ellis Avenue, Chicago 60637
University of Indiana Press, 10th & Morton Streets, Bloomington, Indiana 47401
University of Michigan Press, 615 East University, Ann Arbor, Michigan 48106
University of Washington Press, Seattle, Washington 98105

LIST OF JOURNALS

It is impossible to cite pertinent articles. The following journals, however, are those most likely to contain pertinent information.

American Anthropologist
American Journal of Psychology
American Speech
Anthropological Linguistics
Canadian Journal of Linguistics
College Composition and Communication
College English
Dissertation Abstracts
English
English: A New Language
English Journal
English Teaching Abstracts
English Teaching Bibliography
English Teaching Forum
E(nglish) T(eaching) I(nformation) C(enter) Occasional Papers
Exchange
Florida FL Reporter
Foreign Language Annals
General Linguistics
Glossa
Harvard Educational Review
International Journal of American Linguistics
International Review of Applied Linguistics
Inter-Pret
Journal of the Acoustical Society of America
Journal of English as a Second Language
Journal of Linguistics
Journal of Reading
Journal of Speech and Hearing Research
Journal of Verbal Learning and Verbal Behavior
Language
Language Learning
Linguistics
Linguistics Reporter
Linguist's Review
Modern Language Journal
MST English Quarterly
NAFSA Newsletter
Overseas
PMLA
Quarterly Journal of Speech
Reading Teacher
Speech Teacher
Studies in Linguistics
Teaching English
TESL Reporter
TESOL Newsletter
TESOL Quarterly
Word

The NAFSA Field Service Program wishes to acknowledge the generous assistance of the Members of the Reading Committee of NAFSA's Association of Teachers of English as a Second Language (ATESL) who reviewed this section of the *Guidelines*. Special gratitude is extended to Dr. Robert B. Kaplan, Director of the English Communications Program for Foreign Students at the University of Southern California, for his preparation of the working draft of this section.